

1 Kathryn Rosen, WSBA #29465
2 katierosen@dwt.com
3 John Hodges-Howell, WSBA #42151
4 johnhodgeshowell@dwt.com
5 DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP
6 920 Fifth Avenue, Suite 3300
7 Seattle, WA 98104-1610
8 (206) 622-3150 Telephone
9 (206) 757-7700 Facsimile
10 Paula Lehmann, WSBA #20678
11 paulalehmann@dwt.com
12 Devin Smith, WSBA #42219
13 devinsmith@dwt.com
14 DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP
15 929 108th Avenue NE, Suite 1500
16 Bellevue, WA 98004-4786
17 (425) 646-6100 Telephone
18 (425) 646-6199 Facsimile
19 Attorneys for Defendant

20 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
21 EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT YAKIMA

22 SYLVIA KELLER, DEBBIE SILLS, and
23 SANDY GAYTAN, on behalf of
themselves and all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

VIRGINIA MASON MEDICAL CENTER,
a Washington non-profit corporation doing
business as Virginia Mason Memorial,

Defendant.

No. _____

NOTICE OF REMOVAL

[Clerk's Action Required]

NOTICE OF REMOVAL - 1

(No.: _____)
4829-5151-2501v.2 0107595-000032

Davis Wright Tremaine LLP
LAW OFFICES
Suite 1500
929 108th Avenue NE
Bellevue, WA 98004-4786
425.646.6100 main · 425.646.6199 fax

1 TO: United States District Court for the Eastern District of Washington at
2 Yakima

3 PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1367, 1441,
4 and 1446, Defendant Yakima Valley Memorial Hospital Association d/b/a
5 Virginia Mason Memorial (“Defendant” or “Memorial”)¹ hereby removes this
6 action from the Superior Court of the State of Washington, Yakima County
7 (“Yakima County Superior Court”) to the United States District Court for the
8 Eastern District of Washington at Yakima.
9

10 In support of this notice, Defendant states as follows:

11 1. On January 15, 2020, Plaintiffs Sylvia Keller, Debbie Sills, and
12 Sandy Gaytan (“Plaintiffs”) filed a putative Class Action Complaint in Yakima
13 County Superior Court, cause number 20-2-00170-39.
14

15 2. On January 27, 2020, Plaintiffs completed service of the Summons
16 and Complaint on Virginia Mason Medical Center—which is not the correct
17 corporate entity defendant in this action. A true and correct copy of Plaintiffs’
18 Declaration of Service and Summons and Complaint are attached as **Exhibit A**.
19
20
21

22 ¹ Plaintiffs’ pleadings erroneously identify Virginia Mason Medical Center as the
23 defendant in this lawsuit. By filing this Notice of Removal and associated papers,
Memorial does not waive (and explicitly reserves) the right to assert any defenses
regarding Plaintiffs’ failure to name the correct defendant.

NOTICE OF REMOVAL - 2

(No.: _____)
4829-5151-2501v.2 0107595-000032

Davis Wright Tremaine LLP
LAW OFFICES
Suite 1500
929 108th Avenue NE
Bellevue, WA 98004-4786
425.646.6100 main · 425.646.6199 fax

1 **I. DEFENDANT MEMORIAL HAS SATISFIED THE PROCEDURAL
2 REQUIREMENTS FOR REMOVAL**

3 3. The Complaint asserts putative class claims for alleged wage and
4 hour violations. This Notice of Removal is timely as it is being filed within
5 30 days of service of Plaintiffs' Class Action Complaint, regardless of the fact
6 that Plaintiffs served and named the incorrect defendant.

7 4. Defendant has not yet filed an Answer, but will respond in
8 compliance with the deadline set forth in Fed. R. Civ. P 81(c)(2).

9 5. Venue is proper in the Eastern District of Washington at Yakima
10 because the claim arose in Yakima County, Washington. *See* 28 U.S.C.
11 § 1441(a).

13 6. As required by 28 U.S.C. § 1446(a), copies of all process, pleadings,
14 and orders served on Defendant are being concurrently filed today, along with all
15 process, pleadings, and orders filed in the state court action.

16 7. Notice of this removal will be given to Plaintiffs and the Superior
17 Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1446(d).

19 **II. REMOVAL IS PROPER BECAUSE THIS COURT HAS FEDERAL QUESTION
20 JURISDICTION**

21 8. Removal is proper based on federal question jurisdiction arising
22 under 28 U.S.C §1331, even though Plaintiffs' Complaint styles its claims as
23 arising under state law.

NOTICE OF REMOVAL - 3
(No.: _____)
4829-5151-2501v.2 0107595-000032

Davis Wright Tremaine LLP
LAW OFFICES
Suite 1500
929 108th Avenue NE
Bellevue, WA 98004-4786
425.646.6100 main · 425.646.6199 fax

1 9. “Under the well-pleaded complaint rule, a district court has federal
 2 question jurisdiction if ‘a federal question is presented on the face of the
 3 plaintiffs’ properly pleaded complaint.’” *DeSantiago v. Laborers Int’l Union,*
 4 *Local No. 1140*, 914 F.2d 125, 127 (8th Cir. 1990) (quoting *Caterpillar Inc. v.*
 5 *Williams*, 482 U.S. 386, 392 (1987)); *see also People of the State of California v.*
 6 *Dynegy*, 375 F.3d 831, 838 (9th Cir. 2004) (same).

8 10. The doctrine of complete preemption is recognized as an exception
 9 to the “well-pleaded complaint rule.” *Beneficial Natl Bank v. Anderson*, 539 U.S.
 10 1, 8 (2003) (“*Beneficial*”). “The Supreme Court has concluded that the
 11 preemptive force of some statutes is so strong that they ‘completely preempt’ an
 12 area of state law.” *Balcorta v. Twentieth Century-Fox Film Corp.*, 208 F.3d
 13 1102, 1107 (9th Cir. 2000) (citing *Metropolitan Life Ins. Co. v. Taylor*, 481 U.S.
 14 58, 65 (1987)). “In such instances, any claim purportedly based on that
 15 preempted state law is considered, from its inception, a federal claim, and
 16 therefore arises under federal law.” *Id.*; *see also Beneficial*, 539 U.S. at 8 (“When
 17 the federal statute completely pre-empts the state-law cause of action, a claim
 18 which comes within the scope of that cause of action, even if pleaded in terms of
 19 state law, is in reality based on federal law”).

22 11. The interpretation and enforcement of Collective Bargaining
 23 Agreements (“CBAs”) require scrutiny under federal law. Section 301 of the

NOTICE OF REMOVAL - 4
 (No.: _____)
 4829-5151-2501v.2 0107595-000032

Davis Wright Tremaine LLP
 LAW OFFICES
 Suite 1500
 929 108th Avenue NE
 Bellevue, WA 98004-4786
 425.646.6100 main · 425.646.6199 fax

Labor Management Relations Act (“LMRA”) compels that “suits for violation of contract between an employer and a labor organization representing employees ... may be brought in any district court of the United States having jurisdiction of the parties, without respect to the amount in controversy or without regard to the citizenship of the parties.” 29 U.S.C. § 185(a). Because federal law governs actions concerning the interpretation and enforcement of CBAs, the Supreme Court has found that ***Section 301 “completely preempts” all state law claims that are based upon or require interpretation of a CBA.*** *Allis-Chalmers Corp. v. Lueck*, 471 U.S. 202, 220 (1985) (emphasis added); *Avco Corp. v. Aero Lodge No. 735, Int’l Ass’n of Machinists & Aerospace Workers*, 390 U.S. 557, 560 (1968); *Local 174, Teamsters, etc. v. Lucas Flour Co.*, 369 U.S. 95, 103 (1962); *Beals v. Kiewit Pac. Co.*, 114 F.3d 892, 894 (9th Cir. 1997); *Lopez v. Cont'l Can Co.*, 961 F.2d 147, 148-49 (9th Cir. 1992). This is so even where the complaint disclaims any reliance on a CBA. If the claim arises out of a CBA, the complaint must be recharacterized as a Section 301 suit. *See Olguin v. Inspiration Consolidated Copper Co.*, 740 F.2d 1468, 1472 (9th Cir. 1984). Thus, “[a] claim pleaded under state law that requires the interpretation of a [CBA] is transformed by § 301 of the LMRA into a claim arising under federal law.” *Rissetto v. Plumbers & Steamfitters Local 343*, 94 F.3d 597, 599 (9th Cir. 1996); *see also Schuver v. Midamerican Energy Co.*, 154 F.3d 795, 798-99 (8th Cir. 1998).

NOTICE OF REMOVAL - 5
 (No.: _____)
 4829-5151-2501v.2 0107595-000032

Davis Wright Tremaine LLP
 LAW OFFICES
 Suite 1500
 929 108th Avenue NE
 Bellevue, WA 98004-4786
 425.646.6100 main · 425.646.6199 fax

(affirming denial of motion to remand when defendant asserted federal question jurisdiction under Section 301); *Vera v. Saks & Co.*, 335 F.3d 109, 114 (2nd Cir. 2003) (affirming removal because “unusual pre-emptive power” accorded under section 301 extends to create federal jurisdiction even when the plaintiff’s complaint makes no reference to federal law and appears to plead an adequate state claim) (internal quotations omitted).

12. Here, Plaintiffs allege in Count 1 that Memorial violated the Washington Minimum Wage Act, chapter 49.46 RCW, by failing to pay wages owed, including overtime, for time spent donning and doffing surgical attire. Compl. ¶¶ 6.6-6.10. At minimum, Plaintiffs seek relief in the form of alleged back wages and overtime, less any amount Memorial already paid the employees, interest, and attorneys’ fees, along with declaratory and injunctive relief. *Id.* ¶¶ 6.4, 6.10; *see also* RCW 49.46.090.

13. Plaintiffs allege in Count 2 that Memorial’s alleged improper withholding of wages also violated the Wage Rebate Act, chapter 49.52 RCW. *Id.* ¶¶ 7.1-7.6. Plaintiffs seek relief for this claim in the form of alleged double damages, costs, and attorneys’ fees. *Id.* ¶ 7.6.

14. All three Plaintiffs in this action work in positions that are covered by Collective Bargaining Agreements between Memorial and Service Employees International Union Healthcare 1199NW (“SEIU 1199”). Accordingly, all three

NOTICE OF REMOVAL - 6
(No.: _____)
4829-5151-2501v.2 0107595-000032

Davis Wright Tremaine LLP
LAW OFFICES
Suite 1500
929 108th Avenue NE
Bellevue, WA 98004-4786
425.646.6100 main · 425.646.6199 fax

1 Plaintiffs are represented by a labor union. Various CBAs govern the terms and
2 conditions of each Plaintiff's employment including, without limitation, the
3 instant claims for alleged wage violations and Plaintiffs' ability to recover
4 damages in this lawsuit. SEIU 1199 is the exclusive collective bargaining
5 representative for all registered nurses at Memorial. SEIU 1199 is also the
6 exclusive collective bargaining representative for all full-time, part-time, per
7 diem, occasional, and available service unit employees at Memorial. Plaintiffs
8 Sylvia Keller and Sandy Gaytan are members of the nurse bargaining unit, and
9 Plaintiff Debbie Sills is a member of the service employee bargaining unit. A
10 true and correct copy of the nurses' CBA in effect at all times relevant to this
11 proceeding is attached hereto as **Exhibit B**. A true and correct copy of the
12 service employees' CBA in effect at all times relevant to this proceeding is
13 attached hereto as **Exhibit C**.

15. Both CBAs contain numerous, detailed provisions pertaining to
16 wages, premium pay, shift differentials, hours of work, shift lengths, and hours
17 compensated. *See, e.g.*, Nurses' CBA Articles 6, 7, and 8 and Service CBA
18 Articles 5, 6, and 7. The CBAs also provide for overtime in excess of what state
19 law requires. *Compare, e.g.*, Nurses' CBA Article 6.9 (allowing for daily
20 overtime) *with* RCW 49.46.130 (requiring overtime only after 40 hours in the
21 workweek).

NOTICE OF REMOVAL - 7
(No.: _____)
4829-5151-2501 v.2 0107595-000032

Davis Wright Tremaine LLP
LAW OFFICES
Suite 1500
929 108th Avenue NE
Bellevue, WA 98004-4786
425.646.6100 main · 425.646.6199 fax

1 16. Further, past practices, such as donning and doffing surgical attire
 2 and Memorial's policy of rounding all hours worked to the nearest 15 minutes,
 3 *see* Compl. ¶ 5.4, are incorporated into the CBAs as implied terms. These
 4 implied terms bear on Plaintiffs' claims. *See, e.g., Hawaii Teamsters and Allied*
 5 *Workers Union, Local 996 v. United Parcel Serv.*, 241 F.3d 1177, 1181 (9th Cir.
 6 2001) ("the 'industrial common law' ... 'is equally a part of the collective
 7 bargaining agreement although not expressed in it.'") (citations omitted); *Nat'l*
 8 *Metalcrafters, Div. of Keystone Consol. Indus. v. McNeil*, 784 F.2d 817, 824 (7th
 9 Cir. 1986) (dispute over CBA's interpretation existed where parties filled gaps in
 10 CBA with implied terms); *see also Consol. Rail Corp. v. Ry. Labor Execs.' Ass'n*,
 11 491 U.S. 299, 311-12 (1989) (explaining that implied provisions and past
 12 practices become part of a CBA).

15 17. As the foregoing demonstrates, Plaintiffs' state wage claims cannot
 16 be resolved without an in-depth examination and interpretation of the governing
 17 CBA terms (express and implied) and the past practices between Memorial and
 18 SEIU 1199. For instance, the CBAs do not specifically contemplate donning or
 19 doffing. Thus, to determine whether Memorial properly paid Plaintiffs for time
 20 spent donning and doffing surgical attire, which the Court must do to determine
 21 whether Plaintiffs (and potentially class members) are owed damages, the Court
 22 will have to scrutinize each CBA and the parties' past practices and bargaining

NOTICE OF REMOVAL - 8
 (No.: _____)
 4829-5151-2501v.2 0107595-000032

Davis Wright Tremaine LLP
 LAW OFFICES
 Suite 1500
 929 108th Avenue NE
 Bellevue, WA 98004-4786
 425.646.6100 main · 425.646.6199 fax

1 histories to determine whether “work” as that term is used in the labor agreement
 2 includes donning and doffing activity. If so, it must then interpret the complex
 3 compensation and overtime provisions in the CBAs along with Memorial’s
 4 rounding practices (another implied term in the CBAs) to determine whether
 5 Memorial properly paid Plaintiffs and/or whether additional compensation, if any,
 6 is owed.

8 18. Additionally, both CBAs implicated by Plaintiffs afford more
 9 overtime than what state law requires. Thus, to a significant extent, Plaintiffs’
 10 claims for unpaid wages arise out of the CBAs, not state law, also triggering
 11 Section 301 preemption. *See, e.g., Burnside v. Kiewit Pac. Corp.*, 491 F.3d 1053,
 12 1066 (9th Cir. 2007); *Kobold v. Good Samaritan Reg’l Med. Ctr.*, 832 F.3d 1024,
 13 1032-33 (9th Cir. 2016); *Curry*, 2012 WL 104627 at *6; *Gonzalez v. Farmington*
 14 *Foods, Inc.*, 296 F. Supp. 2d 912, 935 (N.D. Ill. 2003). For this additional reason,
 15 Plaintiffs’ claims for unpaid wages are inextricably intertwined with and
 16 substantially dependent upon the CBAs.

18 19. Of course, the question of whether Memorial “willfully” withheld
 19 wages (for purposes of alleged double damages) by conducting itself in
 20 accordance with bargained-for terms and conditions of work also cannot be
 21 resolved without interpreting and applying the CBAs, the parties’ past practices,
 22 and implied contract terms. *See, e.g.* Compl. ¶¶ 7.3, 7.6.

NOTICE OF REMOVAL - 9
 (No.: _____)
 4829-5151-2501v.2 0107595-000032

Davis Wright Tremaine LLP
 LAW OFFICES
 Suite 1500
 929 108th Avenue NE
 Bellevue, WA 98004-4786
 425.646.6100 main · 425.646.6199 fax

1 20. District courts regularly assert jurisdiction over alleged state wage
 2 and hour claims based on the preemptive power of Section 301. *See, e.g., Vera,*
 3 335 F.3d at 114 (removing state claims for wage deduction violations); *Curry v.*
 4 *Kraft Foods Global, Inc.*, 2012 WL 104627, *5-6 (N.D. Ill., 2012) (removing
 5 state claims for unpaid wages for donning and doffing activities); *Clee v. MVM,*
 6 *Inc.*, 91 F. Supp. 3d 54, 62-64 (D. Mass. 2015) (removing state wage claims for
 7 pre-shift and post-shift work); *Santiago v. Aramark Uniform and Career Apparel,*
 8 *LLC*, No. C 12-04462 JSW, 2012 WL 5868954, * 4 (N.D. Cal., 2012) (removing
 9 state wage claims). *Cf. Firestone v. Southern California Gas Co.*, 219 F.3d 1063,
 10 1066 (9th Cir. 2000) (state wage and hour claims preempted under Section 301);
 11 *Barton v. House of Raeford Farms, Inc.*, 745 F.3d 95, 109 (4th Cir. 2014) (state
 12 claims for wages owed for donning and doffing protective gear preempted by
 13 Section 301). This case is no different.

16 21. Indeed, Plaintiffs *agree* that interpretation of the relevant CBAs and
 17 past practices is required, notwithstanding Plaintiffs' efforts to plead around
 18 Section 301 in their Complaint.

20 22. The Nurses' CBA and the Services' CBA both contain
 21 comprehensive grievance and arbitration procedures. *See* Nurses' CBA
 22 Article 17 and Service CBA Article 16. These procedures are the sole and
 23 exclusive remedy for alleged contract violations. *See, e.g., DelCostello v. Int'l*

NOTICE OF REMOVAL - 10
 (No.: _____)
 4829-5151-2501v.2 0107595-000032

Davis Wright Tremaine LLP
 LAW OFFICES
 Suite 1500
 929 108th Avenue NE
 Bellevue, WA 98004-4786
 425.646.6100 main · 425.646.6199 fax

1 *Broth. of Teamsters*, 462 U.S. 151, 163 (1983); *Clayton v. Int'l Union, United*
 2 *Auto., Aerospace, & Agr. Implement Workers of Am.*, 451 U.S. 679, 681 (1981);
 3 *Republic Steel Corp. v. Maddox*, 379 U.S. 650, 652-653 (1965) (same);
 4 *Soremekun v. Thrifty Payless, Inc.*, 509 F.3d 978, 987-89 (9th Cir. 2017).

5
 6 23. On January 18, 2018, Plaintiff Sylvia Keller filed a grievance on
 7 behalf of “RNs in Surgical Services and similar positions,” alleging that
 8 Memorial violated the CBA by not paying nurses for all “hours worked.” A true
 9 and correct copy of the grievance is attached as **Exhibit D**.

10
 11 24. On April 9, 2019, Memorial and SEIU 1199 executed a settlement
 12 agreement, resolving the grievance prospectively. A true and correct copy of the
 13 settlement agreement is attached as **Exhibit E**. SEIU 1199 submitted the
 14 question of retrospective liability to binding arbitration. A true and correct copy
 15 of the arbitral award, issued in Memorial’s favor, is attached as **Exhibit F**.

16
 17 25. SEIU 1199’s principal contention in the grievance and arbitration
 18 was virtually identical to the claims Plaintiffs assert here, *i.e.*, that Memorial
 19 improperly withheld wages for time spent donning and doffing surgical attire at
 20 the beginning and end of shifts. *See* Ex. F at 4-5. SEIU 1199 also sought
 21 substantially identical relief as Plaintiffs in this case: back pay and overtime, for
 22 both nurses and service employees. *Id.* at 5.

23
 NOTICE OF REMOVAL - 11
 (No.: _____)
 4829-5151-2501v.2 0107595-000032

Davis Wright Tremaine LLP
 LAW OFFICES
 Suite 1500
 929 108th Avenue NE
 Bellevue, WA 98004-4786
 425.646.6100 main · 425.646.6199 fax

1 26. As Plaintiff Sylvia Keller's grievance and arbitration demonstrate,
 2 the instant claims cannot be resolved without deciphering the CBA terms and past
 3 practices. Nor can they be resolved without interpreting the settlement agreement
 4 or the arbitral award, which are also incorporated into the CBA, providing an
 5 additional basis for removing this case to federal court under Section 301. *See,*
 6 *e.g. Int'l Union of Operating Eng'rs, Local 351 v. Cooper Natural Res., Inc.*, 163
 7 F.3d 916, 919 (5th Cir. 1999) (a negotiated last change agreement "must be
 8 thought of as a supplement to the CBA"); Theodore J. St. Antoine, *Judicial
 9 Review of Labor Arbitration Awards: A Second Look at Enterprise Wheel and Its
 10 Progeny*, 75 Mich. L.Rev. 1137, 1160 (1977) ("By definition, the [arbitrator's]
 11 award is the parties' stipulated, adopted contract").
 12
 13

14 27. For the foregoing reasons, this Court has jurisdiction over this civil
 15 action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331. Both Count 1 and Count 2 of the Complaint
 16 arise under Section 301, and this action is properly removed to this Court.
 17
 18

III. THE COURT HAS SUPPLEMENTAL JURISDICTION OVER PLAINTIFFS' CLAIMS

19 23. 28 U.S.C. § 1337(a) confers upon U.S. District Courts supplemental
 20 jurisdiction over all other claims that are related to claims in the action within
 21 such original jurisdiction that they form part of the same case or controversy
 22 under Article III of the United States Constitution. To the extent Plaintiffs'
 23

NOTICE OF REMOVAL - 12
 (No.: _____)
 4829-5151-2501v.2 0107595-000032

Davis Wright Tremaine LLP
 LAW OFFICES
 Suite 1500
 929 108th Avenue NE
 Bellevue, WA 98004-4786
 425.646.6100 main · 425.646.6199 fax

Complaint includes such claims, this Court has supplemental jurisdiction to hear and decide all claims asserted by Plaintiffs in their Complaint.

24. This Notice of Removal is filed subject to and with full reservation of rights. No admission of fact, law, or liability is intended by this Notice of Removal and all defenses, motions, and pleas are expressly reserved.

WHEREFORE, Defendant Memorial hereby removes the above-entitled action and respectfully gives notice that the action is removed from the Yakima County Superior Court to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Washington at Yakima.

DATED this 26th day of February, 2020.

Davis Wright Tremaine LLP
Attorneys for Defendant Memorial

By /s/ Kathryn Rosen
Kathryn Rosen, WSBA #29465
John Hodges-Howell, WSBA #42151
920 Fifth Avenue, Suite 3300
Seattle, WA 98104-1610
Telephone: 206-622-3150
Fax: 206-757-7700
Email: katierosen@dwt.com
johnhodgeshowell@dwt.com

NOTICE OF REMOVAL - 13

(No.: _____)
4829-5151-2501v2 0107595-000032

Davis Wright Tremaine LLP
LAW OFFICES
Suite 1500
929 108th Avenue NE
Bellevue, WA 98004-4786
425.646.6100 main • 425.646.6199 fax

1 By /s/ Devin M. Smith
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

Paula Lehmann, WSBA #20678
Devin M. Smith, WSBA #42219
929 – 108th Avenue NE, Suite 1500
Bellevue, WA 98004
Phone: 425-646-6100
Fax: 425-646-6199
Email: paulalehmann@dwt.com
devinsmith@dwt.com

NOTICE OF REMOVAL - 14
(No.: _____)
4829-5151-2501v.2 0107595-000032

Davis Wright Tremaine LLP
LAW OFFICES
Suite 1500
929 108th Avenue NE
Bellevue, WA 98004-4786
425.646.6100 main · 425.646.6199 fax

1
2 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**
3
4

5 I hereby certify that on this day I filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the
6 Court using the CM/ECF system which will send notification of such filing to the
7 following:
8

9 Toby J. Marshall
10 Erika R. Nusser
11 TERRELL MARSHALL LAW GROUP PLLC
12 936 North 34th Street, Suite 300
13 Seattle, WA 98103
14 tmarshall@terrellmarshall.com
15 enusser@terrellmarshall.com

16 Carson Flora
17 CARSON FLORA, ATTORNEY AT LAW
18 15 S. Grady Way, Suite 200
19 Renton, WA 98057-3739
20 carsonf@seiu1199nw.org

21 DATED this 26th day of February, 2020.
22

23
24 
25

26 _____
27 Susan Bright
28

29
30 NOTICE OF REMOVAL - 15
31 (No.: _____)
32 4829-5151-2501v.2 0107595-000032

33
34 Davis Wright Tremaine LLP
35 LAW OFFICES
36 Suite 1500
37 929 108th Avenue NE
38 Bellevue, WA 98004-4786
39 425.646.6100 main · 425.646.6199 fax